IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DAVID S. TATUM, **CIVIL ACTION**

NO. 12-1114

Plaintiff,

TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICA, INC., TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS AMERICA, INC., TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL, INC., TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS COMPANY

LIMITED, TAKEDA

v.

PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC, TAKEDA AMERICA HOLDINGS, INC., TAKEDA

GLOBAL RESEARCH &

DEVELOPMENT CENTER, INC., TAKEDA SAN DIEGO, INC., TAP PHARMACEUTICALS PRODUCTS,

INC., ABBOTT LABORATORIES, INC., DOES 1 THROUGH 100 INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 18th day of October, 2012, upon consideration of Defendants' Takeda Pharmaceuticals International, Inc., Takeda Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Takeda Global Research & Development Center, Inc., Takeda Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc., Takeda Pharmaceuticals America, Inc. and Punitive Damage Claims of Plaintiffs' [sic] Amended Complaint (Document No. 12, filed June 20, 2012) ("Defendants' Motion to Dismiss") and Plaintiff David S. Tatum's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Document No. 15, filed July 19, 2012), IT IS ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART as follows:

Case 2:12-cv-01114-JD Document 18 Filed 10/19/12 Page 2 of 2

1. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED** with respect to Count I – equitable tolling

of applicable statute of limitations; Count IX – strict product liability: defective design; Count XI – strict

product liability: failure to warn; and Count XIII – unjust enrichment; and all such claims are

DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

2. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is **DENIED** with respect to the remaining claims: Count

V – negligent misrepresentation; Count VI – breach of express warranty; Count VII – breach of

implied warranty for a particular purpose; Count VIII – breach of implied warranty of merchantability;

Count X – strict product liability: manufacturing defect; Count XII – fraudulent concealment; and Count

XIV – violations of Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law.

3. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is **DENIED** with respect to plaintiff's request for

punitive damages.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a preliminary pretrial conference will be scheduled in due

course.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois

JAN E. DuBOIS, J.

2